Amendments to the Drawings

A new sheet of drawings (Figure 15) is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**. Figure 15 is substantially identical to Fig. 2, except that card 121 is replaced by PCMCIA card 125. Additional support for new Figure 15 can be found in the application as originally filed at, for example, page 20, line 17 through page 21, line 15. No new matter is introduced by new Figure 15.

Attachment: new sheet of drawings for Figure 15

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 26, 2006. Claims 1-77 are pending, with claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 54, 64, 68, and 72 being in independent form. The Office Action indicates that claims 64-75 have been allowed. By this Amendment, claims 76 and 77 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-63, 76 and 77 are presented for reconsideration, with claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 44 and 54 being in independent form.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) as purportedly failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The specification was objected to as purportedly having informalities, and more specifically that references in the specification to non-PCMCIA card in connection with element 123 are purportedly inaccurate.

By this Amendment, a new sheet of drawings (Figure 15) which is attached hereto as **Exhibit A** has been added. Figure 15 is substantially identical to Fig. 2, except that card 121 is replaced by PCMCIA card 125. Additional support for new Figure 15 can be found in the application as originally filed at, for example, page 20, line 17 through page 21, line 15. In addition, the specification has been amended to include reference to Figure 15. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant maintains that element 123 in the specification and drawings is properly referenced as non-PCMCIA card, when considered in the context of the example of Fig. 2 in which the specific card standard is PCMCIA. As explained at, for example, pages 16-21 of the specification, the PC card control apparatus 111 is configured to receive a PCMCIA card (125) or an adapting card (121) through PC card connector 113, and the adapting card 121 in turn is configured to receive a non-PCMCIA card 123 through connector 122.

PCMCIA ExpressCard, as understood by Applicant, has a form factor which enables it to

be received through a PC card connector without an adapting card.

Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings and the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 12, 13, 17, 23, 24, 28, 34, 35, 39, 44, 45, 49, 54, 55 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,684,283 to Harris in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0059860 to Liu et al.

Applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's comments and the cited art, and respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 44 and 54 are patentable over the cited art, for at least the following reasons.

This application relates to control of a host system when a first PC card (compliant with a specific card standard) or a second PC card (not compliant with the specific card standard) is connected to a PC card connector of the host system. The PC card connector is configured for connection to the first PC card and for connection to the second PC card (with or without a card-adaptor card). In any event, connection of the second PC card to the PC card control apparatus is detected, a detection signal is output based on the detection, and the connections of the PC card connector are switched to connect the PC card connector to a bus interface dedicated to the second PC card upon receiving the detection signal. Each of independent claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 44 and 54 addresses these features, as well as additional features.

Harris, as understood by Applicant, proposes an approach for interfacing a CardBay card to a host system which includes a system bus and a CardBay controller running CardBus and 16-bit CSS (Card and Select Services) software. The CardBay (or CardBus or 16-bit) card is received through a PC card interface of the host system. In place of the CardBay (or CardBus or 16-bit) card, an adapter bearing a media card may be inserted in the PC card slot.

Harris, column 3, lines 50-55, proposes that the CardBay controller further include card detect logic to determine if the inserted card is a 16-bit, CardBus or CardBay card. On the other hand, if an adapter is used for a media card, the adapter must have logic to translate from the media card interface to the PC Card interface (column 2, lines 40-47) and the CardBay controller has similar logic integrated therein (column 3, lines 47-50).

However, while Harris proposes that the CardBay controller include card detect logic to determine if the inserted card is a 16-bit, CardBus or CardBay card, Harris (as acknowledged in the Office Action) does not disclose or suggest detecting insertion of the card-adapting card in the PC card control apparatus, outputting a detection signal based on the detection, and switching the connections of the PC card connector to connect the PC card connector to a bus interface dedicated to the second PC card upon receiving the detection signal.

Liu, as understood by Applicant, proposes a double interface adaptor which includes a PCMCIA interface and a USB interface circuit and enables a user to use a memory card with a host system through a PC Card slot of the host or, when the double interface adaptor is connected to an additional USB interface assembly, through a USB connector of the host system. In the double interface adaptor proposed by Liu, an interface detection and selection circuit 23 detects whether the adaptor is connected to a PC Card slot of the host or is connected through an additional USB interface assembly to a USB connector.

However, it is noted that the adaptor of Liu is no different than conventional adaptor devices which are external to the host system and attempts to enable a user to plug a choice of varying cards into an I/O port of the host.

Moreover, the double interface adaptor and USB interface assembly of Liu is external to the host system, and Liu, like Harris, does not disclose or suggest switching the connections of

the PC card connector (for example, element 113 in host 100 of the present application) to connect the PC card connector to a bus interface (for example, USB B105 and 118 of the present application) dedicated to the second PC card upon receiving the detection signal, as provided by claim 1 of the present application.

Independent claims 12, 23, 34, 44 and 54 are patentably distinct from the cited art for at least similar reasons.

Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 44 and 54, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable over the cited art.

The Office Action indicates that claims 64-75 are allowed.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance in the Office Action and submits that the allowed claims recite subject matter which further supports patentability for reasons in addition to those identified in the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance in the Office Action.

The Office Action indicates that claims 3-5, 7-11, 13-16, 18-22, 25-27, 29-33, 35-38, 40-43, 46-48, 50-53, 56-58 and 60-63 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, since independent claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 54 are submitted to be patentable over the cited art, no changes to the form of claims 3-5, 7-11, 13-16, 18-22, 25-27, 29-33, 35-38, 40-43, 46-48, 50-53, 56-58, and 60-63 are believed to be necessary.

In view of the remarks hereinabove, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the allowance of the

application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837
Attorney for Applicant
Cooper & Dunham LLP
Tel.: (212) 278-0400

EXHIBIT A

to
AMENDMENT
(Serial No. 10/816,063)